

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/652,113 08/28/2003		08/28/2003	Ernest W. Moody	MOODY 41	1843		
24258	7590	11/18/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
JOHN EDV	VARD R	OETHEL	LAYNO, BENJAMIN				
2290 S. JON	ES BLVE	D. #100					
LAS VEGAS, NV 89146				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			•	3711			

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Application No. Applicant(s)					
	Office Action Communication	10/652,113	MOODY, ERNES	MOODY, ERNEST W.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Benjamin H. Layno	3711					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence a	ddress				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a) In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become AB/	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered time 'HS from the mailing date of this and the control of th					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05	August 2004.						
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) TI	nis action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.						
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn The oath or declaration is objected to by the							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this Nationa	I Stage				
	<i>u</i> ,							
Attachment 1) Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) T Interview St	ummary (PTO-413)					
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (FTO-092) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PT	⁻ O-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/05/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains the 103 rejection in the first Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Awada 943'. See the first Office action.

The Applicant has argued that Crawford's method of play is clearly a game of skill, wherein players must analyze which cards to hold and which cards to discard and replace. While the Applicant's invention removes all of the skill aspects of the method of play since Applicant's method of play is stud poker without any holding or discarding or replacement of cards. The Applicant also states that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Crawford that his skill game could be modified by making it a stud poker game; in fact to modify Crawford to remove the discard and draw steps of his game would be to defeat the basis for his method of play which is a skill poker game.

4. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

Art Unit: 3711

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, stud poker is a well known game in casinos. It is also well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time it takes to play a hand of stud poker is shorter than the time it takes to play a hand of draw poker. Thus, in view of such teaching, and in view of Awada 943' teaching in the first Office action, it would have been obvious to make Crawford's draw poker game a stud poker game. This modification would have eliminated the draw step in Crawford's game shortening playing time and increasing profits and revenue.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin H. Layno whose telephone number is (571) 272-4424. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on (571)272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin H. Layno Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

bhl